

From: MAIL [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 May 2016 13:06
To: Quigley, Elaine
Subject: Re: PLANNING APPLICATIONS 2015/7036/P and 2015/6843/P for the GARDEN HOUSE at 1 ELLERDALE ROAD

Thank you for sending us the latest documentation for the Garden House planning application (included at the base of this email).

We are pleased to see the change to the rooflights and to note that they will not be sliding rooflights with a mechanism. Obviously we are not keen on photovoltaic cells positioned this low down and so visible. If they were on a rooftop and out of sight we wouldn't have objected. We fully appreciate the benefit they provide. Are they absolutely necessary to this particular build? Are they a requirement for all new developments under the London Plan?

It isn't clear from the drawing whether the PVs proposed would be static or moveable. Obviously static would be less obtrusive. Also presumably the intention would be that they should be of an aesthetic appearance without unsuitable and unattractive framing and mountings. Having seen on the Continent some very neat installations we would at the very least be looking for the developer to make this as attractive as possible.

What we are still very concerned about is the position of the kitchen extractor. It is a small item but will impact on our neighbours in Flat A all the time as it is by their kitchen window and on us whenever we use our roof terrace. (see picture below). The extractor needs to be sited much further away from the existing extension to 1 Ellerdale Road so there is a chance for the fumes and grease to be dispersed.

Kind regards
Tim and Eileen Graham



On 26 May 2016, at 16:12, Quigley, Elaine wrote:

Dear Tim and Eileen

I am writing with regards to the above applications. Following discussions with the agent the attached revised drawings have been submitted. These drawings and reports are available to view on our website.

I hope this information is of use to you.

Kind regards

Elaine

Elaine Quigley

Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 5101

From: MAIL [REDACTED]

Sent: 29 February 2016 08:23

To: Quigley, Elaine

Subject: Re: PLANNING APPLICATIONS 2015/7036/P and 2015/6843/P for the GARDEN HOUSE at 1 ELLERDALE ROAD

From: MAIL [REDACTED]

Sent: 24 February 2016 13:38

To: Quigley, Elaine

Subject: PLANNING APPLICATIONS 2015/7036/P and 2015/6843/P for the GARDEN HOUSE at 1 ELLERDALE ROAD

Dear Ms Quigley

We are writing in respect of the above planning applications for the Garden House at 1 Ellerdale Road NW3 6BA. We are in the process of buying the first floor flat (Flat B) at 1 Ellerdale Road so we will be the home most affected by the revisions which have been applied for. We understand that the applicant has a short window of opportunity for facilitating the start of his works so we are definitely not attempting to delay the start of the works. We are simply looking for some concerns we have to be taken into consideration at this time. Camden Planners will have their own views, of course. We know that there were objections from residents at 1 Ellerdale Road and in Fitzjohns Avenue to previous planning applications but it's likely that by now everyone is keen for the work to get started and, more importantly, finished as this has gone on for well over a decade, so it wouldn't be surprising if you didn't hear from others this time around.

First we need to clarify a wrong impression given that the metal railings above the existing kitchen extension are for a 'fire escape' (see screenshot below for actual description). The railings in fact enclose a roof terrace that has been enjoyed for many years by the owners of Flat B for sitting out at table and chairs. Also the same document at 2.6 states 'The site itself is well screened from residents by existing trees and landscaping within neighbouring rear gardens and is not visible from the public realm' That is now unlikely to be the case as trees are being removed and there are no trees to screen the property from residents in all three flats at 1 Ellerdale Road and the flats at 3 Ellerdale Road. Occupants of the flats at the new Pegasus block (the former Arthur West House) will also be looking out at this property as will 81 and 83 Fitzjohns Avenue.

We note that there are two applications for consideration currently by Camden Planning: one being for a structure with two basement storeys (2015/7036P Floor & Roof Plan dated 26 October 2015) and the other being for one basement storey (2015/6843/P Floor & Roof Plan dated 30 November 2015). The version with two basement storeys would naturally take longer to construct creating more disturbance for all neighbouring properties but positions the kitchen further away from our sitting out area. If the one storey version is preferred by planners we would hope it could be ensured that the extractor vents for kitchen and for boiler would not release close to our roof terrace and presumably the residents of Flat A would equally not want them too close to their living area.

Our biggest concern, however, relates to the big change in the roof design. When we started the process of buying Flat B we felt that a sedum roof with modest roof lights in the approved plan would not be too unsightly. Both new applications are for much more infrastructure on the roof and much less sedum planting. The new proposals for 10 photovoltaic panels and four rooflights (the larger two of which would be motorized for opening) would be unsightly for all surrounding properties in what is a Conservation Area. Even if flat panels that didn't move they would be very obvious in the landscape but we presume that the panels will be mechanised to tilt towards sunlight. Because of where South is it would be likely that all the properties in 1 & 3 Ellerdale Road and some in Fitzjohns Avenue would be looking at the raising mechanism for most of the time. In a Conservation Area this surely isn't right and particularly since the low level of the property means that anyone looking out at their garden would be treated to such an unsightly array of panels. Also a new element has been introduced: noise. Although it isn't clear from the plans it is presumably intended that the large opening roof lights will also be motorised. Between the photovoltaic panels and the large mechanized rooflights we feel that the look of the property in the latest proposed plans has become far more industrial in appearance than the original approved sedum roof.

We do hope that the owner of the site will be able proceed to his timescale but we are obviously hoping that something can be done to make the roof less intrusive for us and the surrounding properties. We are not questioning the structure going ahead, simply some of the latest revisions.

best regards

Tim and Eileen Graham

We have attached some photographs and plans to illustrate our concerns